

SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW	Docket No. N0004/7001C2
<p>Applicant: Ranalli et al.  Serial No: 10/802,935  Filed: March 18, 2004  For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ACCESSING A NETWORK  COMPUTER TO ESTABLISH A PUSH-TO-TALK SESSION  Examiner: Andrew Wendell  Art Unit: 2618  Conf. No.: 5158</p>	

This is in reply to the Interview Summary mailed April 10, 2008, to which response is due May 10, 2008. Applicant submits this reply by facsimile (571-273-0557) and by electronic filing.

On April 9, 2008, applicant filed a petition for extension of time and an amendment which included the following Substance of the Interview:

#### **Interview Summary and Amended Claims**

On October 8, 2008, the undersigned attorney and the first named inventor, Douglas Ranalli, held a personal interview with Examiner Wendell to discuss the prior art. Applicant provided the attached "USPTO Office Action Response – Background Material" which reviews the examiner's assumptions regarding the prior art, and applicant's points distinguishing the prior art. After reviewing the same, the Examiner suggested that applicant amend the claims to more clearly recite the differences as argued over the prior art.

Applicant submits herewith amendments to each of the independent method and apparatus claim 1, 8 and 14. These amendments are believed to clarify the environment in which the invention is operative, which may be considered as having been implied in the original claim language but now made express. If the examiner has any questions concerning these amendments, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

The principal references, Maggenti and Crockett 339, are discussed in the attachment. The remaining references, Szurkowski, Kaneko and Crockett 249, were discussed and distinguished in applicant's prior responses; to the extent necessary, applicant relies on without repeating these prior arguments.

In summary, the primary reference Maggenti requires registration of the CD in order to communicate in the PTT session. The secondary reference Szurkowski, does not relate to PTT service, but rather describes a teleconferencing and facsimile communication system. The primary and secondary references cannot properly be combined as the references themselves teach against such a combination. Maggenti (paragraphs 0036-37) distinguishes a conference call system (Szurkowski) as being inapplicable to (Maggenti's) group communications (i.e. arbitrated PTT communications system allowing group communications between CD's and

authorized net members based on a net membership and registration list maintained by CM218). The third reference, Crockett 339 extends a PTT service to enable a registered user to dynamically add a new CD to an existing group communication session with a caveat that the new user must be pre-registered with the CM (a regionalized PTT application server infrastructure). Thus, the combination still requires registration of the CD's. The fourth reference Kaneko is simply relied on for teaching that a SIP-URI can be further resolved into an IP address and port number for receiving PTT sessions at the destination network. This fails to cure the deficiencies of the other references. Similarly, Crockett 249, like Crockett 339 and Maggenti (all having common inventors and all owned by Qualcomm), describe the same type of system in which the CD's must all be registered with the PTT service provider system.

Thus, applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the subject matter claimed by applicant.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the foregoing summary (filed April 9) is complete and satisfies the requirements under Section 713.04. If any further information is requested, the patent office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

On May 5, 2007, applicant confirmed with Examiner Wendell the above recited filing of a summary of the interview on April 9. Examiner Wendell suggested applicant file a copy of that summary by facsimile (571-273-0557) in a separate reply to the Interview Summary, consistent with the one-month or thirty (30) day response period set forth in the examiner Interview Summary mailed April 10, 2008.

If any further information is required, I request that the patent office contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Therese A. Hendricks/ Date: 08 May 2008

Therese A. Hendricks, Esq., Reg. No. 30,389  
Rissman Jobse Hendricks & Oliverio, LLP  
Customer Number 021127  
Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656